

### Solution 1: VC Dimension

Consider a binary classification learning problem with feature space  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^p$  and label space  $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, 1\}$ .

- (a) Let  $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  be an arbitrary point. Then,  $h_{x_1}(x_1) = +1$  and  $h_{x_1-1}(x_1) = -1$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H}$  shatters  $\{x_1\}$  and we infer that  $VC_1(\mathcal{H}) \geq 1$ .

Now, let  $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  be another arbitrary point such that (w.l.o.g.<sup>1</sup>)  $x_1 < x_2$ . Note that  $h_r(x_2) = +1$  implies  $h_r(x_1) = +1$ . Thus, there is no  $h_r \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $(h_r(x_1), h_r(x_2))^\top = (-1, 1)^\top$  (or  $(h_r(x_2), h_r(x_1))^\top = (1, -1)^\top$ ) holds. We infer that  $VC_1(\mathcal{H}) < 2$ , as two points cannot be shattered by  $\mathcal{H}$ . With this, we conclude that  $VC_1(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ .

- (b) Let  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  be some arbitrary points such that (w.l.o.g.<sup>1</sup>)  $x_1 < x_2$ . Note that  $\tilde{h}_l(x_1) = +1$  implies  $\tilde{h}_l(x_2) = +1$ . We can generate every possible assignment  $(y_1, y_2)^\top \in \mathcal{Y}^2$  for  $x_1, x_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (-1, -1)^\top &= (h_{x_1-1}(x_1), h_{x_1-1}(x_2))^\top, \\ (-1, 1)^\top &= \left( \tilde{h}_{\frac{x_1+x_2}{2}}(x_1), \tilde{h}_{\frac{x_1+x_2}{2}}(x_2) \right)^\top, \\ (1, -1)^\top &= (h_{x_1}(x_1), h_{x_1}(x_2))^\top, \\ (1, 1)^\top &= (h_{x_2}(x_1), h_{x_2}(x_2))^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}'$  shatters  $\{x_1, x_2\}$  and we infer that  $VC_1(\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}') \geq 2$ .

Now, let  $x_3 \in \mathbb{R}$  be another arbitrary point such that (w.l.o.g.<sup>1</sup>)  $x_2 < x_3$ . There is no  $h \in \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}'$  such that  $(h(x_1), h(x_2), h(x_3))^\top = (1, -1, 1)^\top$  holds. Indeed,  $h$  is either a

- left-open classifier, i.e.  $h = h_r$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , so that  $h(x_3) = +1$  implies  $h(x_2) = +1$ ,
- right-open classifier, i.e.  $h = \tilde{h}_l$  for some  $l \in \mathbb{R}$ , so that  $h(x_1) = +1$  implies  $h(x_2) = +1$ .

Therefore, we infer that  $VC_1(\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}') < 3$ , as three points cannot be shattered by  $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}'$ . With this, we conclude that  $VC_1(\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}') = 2$ .

- (c) One arbitrary point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  can be shattered since  $h_{p+1} \equiv -1$  and  $h_0 \equiv 1$ . Therefore,  $VC_p(\mathcal{H}) \geq 1$ .

Now define  $N_1(\mathbf{x}) = \#\{x_j = 1 \mid \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)\}$ , which denotes the number of ones in  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ . If  $N_1(\mathbf{x}) = N_1(\mathbf{x}')$ , then  $h_t(\mathbf{x}) = h_t(\mathbf{x}'), \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}, t \in \{0, \dots, p+1\}$ , i.e., the ordering of the zeros resp. ones is not relevant, but only their total number. Thus, the “interesting” candidate points are

$$X_{cand} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

But for each  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X_{cand}$  it holds that  $\exists t : (h_t(\mathbf{x}), h_t(\mathbf{x}')) = (-1, 1)$ , then  $\forall t' \in \{0, \dots, p+1\}$   $(h_{t'}(\mathbf{x}), h_{t'}(\mathbf{x}')) \neq (1, -1)$ . We can show this indirectly, by assuming such a  $t'$  exists and distinguish two cases:

- $t' < t$ , then  $h_t(\mathbf{x}') = 1 \implies h_{t'}(\mathbf{x}') = 1$
- $t' \geq t$ , then  $h_t(\mathbf{x}) = -1 \implies h_{t'}(\mathbf{x}) = -1$

Both implications are contradictions. It can be shown similarly: if for each  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X_{cand}$  it holds that  $\exists t : (h_t(\mathbf{x}), h_t(\mathbf{x}')) = (1, -1)$ , then  $\forall t' \in \{0, \dots, p+1\}$   $(h_{t'}(\mathbf{x}), h_{t'}(\mathbf{x}')) \neq (-1, 1)$ . Hence,  $VC_p(\mathcal{H}) < 2$  as two points cannot be shattered by  $\mathcal{H}$ . In summary, we conclude that  $VC_p(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ .

<sup>1</sup>Otherwise, relabel the points.

- (d) Let  $B := \log_2(|\mathcal{H}|) + 1$  and consider  $B$  many arbitrary points  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_B$ . Note that there are  $2^B$  many possible assignments for these points, as each point can be assigned either a  $+1$  or a  $-1$ . This corresponds to  $2^B = 2^{\log_2(|\mathcal{H}|)+1} = 2|\mathcal{H}|$  many possible assignments. In other words,  $\mathcal{H}$  should be able to provide all  $2|\mathcal{H}|$  many possible assignments in order to shatter the points  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_B$ .

However, each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  can provide only one assignment  $(h(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, h(\mathbf{x}_B))^\top \in \mathcal{Y}^B$ , which means that **at most**  $|\mathcal{H}|$  many different assignments are possible. Thus,  $|\mathcal{H}|$  cannot shatter  $B$  many points, so that  $VC_p(\mathcal{H}) \leq B - 1 = \log_2(|\mathcal{H}|)$ .